

REMARKS

Claims 1-68 were presented for examination.

Claims 1-68 were subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Restriction was required under 35 U.S.C. §121 among the following inventions:

Invention I (claims 2-23 and 46-68); and Invention II (claims 24-45). Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. In the Office Action, the Inventions are alleged to be distinct because the process as claimed does not require the use of the apparatus as claimed. MPEP sec 806.05(e).

Applicants respectfully traverse this restriction. Although it is proper grounds for restriction if a process as claimed does not require the use of the apparatus as claimed, “[t]he burden is on the Examiner to provide reasonable examples that recite material differences.” MPEP sec 806.05(e). The Office Action does not provide any examples. It simply asserts that the process as claimed does not require the use of the apparatus as claimed. Therefore, the Examiner’s burden of proof has not been met and the restriction requirement is not proper. Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be removed.

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

In order for this response to be complete, Applicants are required to conditionally elect one of the Inventions. Applicants conditionally elect Invention I (claims 2-23 and 46-68). If the Examiner believes that for any reason direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: DEC. 7, 2005

By: 

Michael W. Farn
Registration No. 41,015

Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
(650) 335-7823 (Tel)
(650) 938-5200 (Fax)